DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 447 24 CS 000 394

AUTHOR Turnure, James E.; Samuels, S. Jay
TITLE Attention and Reading Achievement in First Grade Boys and Girls. Research Report No. 43.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Research, Development, and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO RR-43
BUREAU NO 332189
PUB DATE Dec 72
GRANT OEG-09-332189-4533(032)
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Failure; *Attention; *Beginning Reading; *Grade 1; *Reading Achievement; Reading Instruction; *Sex Differences; Student Behavior; Task Performance; Word Recognition

ABSTRACT

Eighty-eight first graders (53 boys and 35 girls) were observed to determine whether attentiveness (visual orienting behavior, or direction of gaze) was related to reading achievement prior to the effects of long-term success-failure school experiences and whether the expected superior reading achievement of girls was related to observed attentiveness in the classroom. An observer was assigned to each of the four classrooms to record the attentional behaviors of the pupils during the reading hour; 15 visits were made over the course of a month. Positive attentiveness included task relevant behaviors, whereas non-task orienting behavior was scored negatively. Results indicated that girls were significantly more attentive than boys and achieved higher word recognition scores. Word recognition was found to be significantly related to attentiveness for the group as a whole, with reading readiness controlled in a covariance analysis. It was concluded that overt, task relevant, orienting behavior was related to scholastic achievement and was acquired in beginning reading, before a long history of academic success-failure had been established. (Author/HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CS EC
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED 074447

RESEARCH REPORT #43

Project No. 332189
Grant No. OE-09-332189-4533 (032)

ATTENTION AND READING ACHIEVEMENT IN FIRST GRADE BOYS AND GIRLS[1]

James E. Turnure and S. Jay Samuels
University of Minnesota
Research, Development and Demonstration
Center in Education of Handicapped Children
Minneapolis, Minnesota

December 1972

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
U. S. Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

os 000 394

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TECHNICAL REPORTS

University of Minnesota Research, Development and Demonstration
Center in Education of Handicapped Children

(Place of publication shown in parentheses where applicable)

1. J. Turnure & S. Samuels. Attention and reading achievement in first grade boys and girls. Research Report #43. November 1972.

2. R. Riegel, A. Taylor, S. Clarren, & F. Danner. Training educationally handicapped children to use associative grouping strategies for the organization and recall of categorizable material. Research Report #42. November 1972.

3. R. Riegel, F. Danner, & A. Taylor. Steps in sequence: Training educationally handicapped children to use strategies for learning. Development Report #2. November 1972.

4. A. Taylor, J. Turnure, & M. Thurlow. From research to development: The Math Vocabulary Program. Development Report #1. October 1972.

5. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. The effects of structural variations in elaboration on learning by normal and EMR children. Research Report #41. September 1972.

6. A. Taylor & N. Bender. Variations of strategy training and the recognition memory of EMR children. Research Report #40. September 1972.

7. D. Moores, C. McIntyre, & K. Weiss. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired children: Report of 1971-1972. Research Report #39. September 1972.

8. R. Rubin. Follow-up of applicants for admission to graduate programs in special education. Occasional Paper #11. July 1972.

9. D. Moores. Communication - Some unanswered questions and some unquestioned answers. Occasional Paper #10. July 1972.

10. A. Taylor & S. Whitely. Overt verbalization and the continued production of effective elaborations by EMR children. Research Report #38. June 1972.

11. R. Riegel. Measuring educationally handicapped children's organizational strategies by sampling overt groupings. Research Report #37. May 1972.

12. E. Gallistel, M. Boyle, L. Curran, & M. Hawthorne. The relation of visual and auditory aptitudes to first grade low readers' achievement under sight-word and systematic phonic instruction. Research Report #36. May 1972.

13. E. Gallistel & P. Fischer. Decoding skills acquired by low readers taught in regular classrooms using clinical techniques. Research Report #35. May 1972.

14. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration in children: Variations in procedures and design. Research Report #34. March 1972.

15. D. Krus & W. Bart. An ordering-theoretic method of multidimensional scaling of items. Research Report #33. March 1972.

16. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Effects of various instruction and reinforcement conditions on the learning of a three-position oddity problem by nursery school children. Research Report #32. March 1972.

17. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Outerdirectedness in mentally retarded children as a function of sex of experimenter and sex of subject. Research Report #31. March 1972.

18. J. Rynders & J. Horrobin. A mobile unit for delivering educational services to Down's Syndrome (Mongoloid) infants. Research Report #30. January 1972. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children, Special National Conference, Memphis, December, 1971).

19. F. Danner & A. Taylor. Pictures and relational imagery training in children's learning. Research Report #29. December 1971.

20. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration phenomena in nursery school children. Research Report #28. December 1971.

21. D. Moores & C. McIntyre. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired children: Progress report 1970-1971. Research Report #27. December 1971.

22. S. Samuels. Success and failure in learning to read: A critique of the research. Occasional Paper #9. November 1971. (In M. Kling, the Literature of Research in Reading with Emphasis on Modes, Rutgers University, 1971).

23. S. Samuels. Attention and visual memory in reading acquisition*. Research Report #26. November, 1971.

24. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration and the promotion of transfer of training in educable mentally retarded. Research Report #25. November 1971. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, in press.

25. A. Taylor, M. Josberger, & S. Whitely. Elaboration training and verbalization as factors facilitating retarded children's recall. Research Report #24. October 1971.

ED 074447

RESEARCH REPORT #43

Project No. 332189
Grant No. OE-09-332189-4533 (032)

ATTENTION AND READING ACHIEVEMENT IN FIRST GRADE BOYS AND GIRLS[1]

James E. Turnure and S. Jay Samuels

Research, Development and Demonstration
Center in Education of Handicapped Children
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

December 1972

The materials presented herein were developed pursuant to a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Center for Research, Development and Demonstration in Education of Handicapped Children, Department of Special Education, University of Minnesota. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official position of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
U. S. Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Attention and Reading Achievement in First Grade Boys and Girls

James E. Turnure and S. Jay Samuels
University of Minnesota

Abstract

A behavior observation schedule was utilized to investigate sex differences in classroom attentiveness, and the relationship of such attentiveness to reading achievement among first-grade children, 74 boys and 58 girls. Girls were found to be significantly ($p < .01$) more attentive than boys, and to achieve higher word recognition scores ($p < .05$). Further, word recognition was found to be significantly ($p < .01$) related to attentiveness for the group as a whole, with reading readiness controlled in a covariance analysis. This latter finding replicates previous results with fourth and sixth grade pupils, but demonstrates that the relationship obtains with beginning readers, before a history of academic success - failure has been established.

ATTENTION AND READING ACHIEVEMENT IN FIRST GRADE BOYS AND GIRLS[1]

James E. Turnure and S. Jay Samuels
University of Minnesota

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there are sex differences in classroom attentiveness, and to determine if attention [i.e., visual orienting behavior, or direction of gaze (Turnure, 1970; 1971)] is related to reading achievement.

Numerous studies in reading have reported that, in naturalistic classroom settings, reading achievement of girls is superior to boys (Dykstra, 1967; Gates, 1961). However, in the laboratory, where attentional behavior of the subject is more easily controlled, sex differences in reading-analogous paired-associate learning are not found (Jeffrey & Samuels, 1967; Peterson, 1972). There have been some demonstrations that the performance of boys is superior to girls on a reading type task under certain classroom conditions (McNeil, 1964); in this latter study, orienting behavior was controlled through placing students in cubicles and utilizing headphones for audio input.

When asked why students succeed in a particular subject matter, teachers tend to attribute success to teacher-controlled variables such as methodology. On the other hand, academic failure is generally explained by reference to intra-student variables, such as lack of intelligence, readiness, motivation, or attention (Baldwin, Johnson & Wiley, 1970).

A recent study by Lahaderne (1968) reported that school achievement at grade six was related to attention. A similar finding was reported by Cobb (1972) for fourth grade pupils. However, when measurements come this late in the child's academic career, one cannot be sure if inattentiveness may not represent avoidance behavior resulting from academic failure (i.e., lack of school success may lead to inattentiveness rather than the reverse, since lack of reinforcement in school settings generally leads to extinction of task relevant behaviors).

By replicating Lahaderne's study in grade one, we hoped to determine whether attentiveness was related to academic achievement (i.e., reading) prior to the effects of long-term success-failure school experiences. In addition, the study was designed to determine if the expected superior reading achievement of girls was related to observed attentiveness in the classroom.

Method

Subjects

Eighty-eight first graders, 53 boys and 35 girls, were observed. The subjects were obtained from four classrooms in two middle-class schools in the Minneapolis school system. The teachers in these schools used traditional three group reading methods and basal reader materials.

Procedure

An observer was assigned to each of the four classrooms to record the attentional behaviors of the pupils during the reading

hour. Attention was defined and measured in a manner similar to that reported by Lahaderne (1968). Task relevant behaviors (i.e., eyes oriented to text or teacher, working on reading follow-up exercises, observing chalkboard or overhead projection, or otherwise following the instructional directions of the teacher) were scored as positive instances of attentiveness. Negative attentiveness consisted of non-task orienting behavior, such as: failure to follow instructional directions, closed eyes, working or playing with non-assigned materials, etc.

Attentive and inattentive behaviors were recorded on a scoring sheet that listed the children's names according to their reading groups. Each child was observed in sequence in accordance with his listing on the scoring sheet. A six second scoring method was used. A child was observed for four seconds, and in the next two seconds a plus (+) or minus (-) was entered on the scoring sheet representing the observer's judgment of task attentiveness or inattentiveness, respectivelv. Question marks signified ambiguous instances where it was uncertain to the observer whether or not the pupil was attentive. It was possible to record 600 observations during each reading hour. Observers made fifteen visits to each classroom over the course of a month. The attentional data used for analysis was a proportion score comprised of the number of positive instances divided by the total number of both positive and negative instances; question marks were excluded.

Reliability.

A video tape was made of first grade children grouped around a table doing reading follow-up work. A 15 minute segment of the film was selected for training purposes, and a two minute segment not previously exposed was retained for the test of inter-rater reliability.

Using the six-second scoring method described earlier, observer reliability was calculated by dividing the total number of agreements by the total number of recorded behaviors. This resulted in a reliability of 89%, which is similar to that reported by Cobb (1972; 83%) and Lahaderne (1968; 83%-100%).

Reading Achievement Measure.

Reading achievement was measured by presenting 45 words, randomly selected from the Dolch list of basic sight-words, for recognition. Each of these words was typed onto a 3"x 5" card, with a primary typewriter. The words were presented individually and the student was given up to six seconds to respond. The experimenter recorded all correct responses on a score sheet. No feedback was given on the test.

Data Analysis. Reading readiness scores were available and were used as a covariate in the analysis of word recognition. These readiness scores were also used in analyzing the data by means of partial correlations. Attention scores were placed in four quartiles: Q_1 = .68 and below; Q_2 = .69 - .80; Q_3 = .81; Q_4 = .88 and above.

A subject, for example, was placed in quartile Q_1 if he was attentive 68% of the time or less. Attention and sex served as the two independent variables in the ANCOVA of word recognition scores.

Results

Sex differences in reading readiness & attention. The mean reading readiness score for the boys was 67.43 (SD = 18.14) and the mean for the girls was 64.34 (SD = 27.18). Comparing these two means by t-tests indicated that the difference was not significant ($t < 1$, $df = 86$, NS).

Comparing the two sexes on attention indicated that the mean attention score for the boys was .76 (SD = .13) and the mean for the girls was .84 (SD = .10). This difference in attention was significant in favor of girls ($t = 3.08$, $df = 86$, $P < .01$).

Attention & reading achievement. Table one shows the mean word recognition scores for each of the attention categories and for the two sexes. Inspection of the table indicates that as attention increases, there is a corresponding increase in word recognition. Also, the females have a higher recognition score in comparison to males. A Sex X Attention ANCOVA of these scores, using reading readiness as the covariate, found the following: a significant main effect for attention ($F = 8.46$, $df = 3,79$, $P < .001$); and a significant main effect for sex ($F = 3.96$, $df = 1,79$, $P < .05$). The Sex X Attention interaction was not significant ($F<1$).

Newman - Keuls tests were computed to determine which of the word recognition scores were significantly different from each other for

each of the four attention categories. The following was found: All comparisons were significantly different from each other at the $P < .05$ level or better, with the exception of Q_2 and Q_3.

In order to facilitate comparability from the present study to the reports of Lahaderne (1968) and Cobb (1972), correlations between attention and word recognition were computed. A Pearson product-moment correlation of .44 was computed, which is significant at the $p < .01$ level. This correlation is close to the value found between attention and reading achievement by Cobb ($r = .45$) for the fourth grade and by Lahaderne ($r = .51$ to $.39$) for sixth graders. The partial correlation in this study, conducted between the variables of attention and word recognition and controlling for reading readiness, was .44.

Discussion

In this study, it was found that girls were significantly superior to boys in word recognition, as had been previously reported, and significantly superior in classroom attentiveness as well. We also found that increasing degrees of attention were related to superior word recognition. Thus, like Lahaderne, and more recently Cobb and Hops, we too found that overt, task relevant, orienting behavior was related to scholastic achievement; furthermore, this relationship was obtained in beginning reading, before a long history of academic failure had been established.

Environmental factors have an important effect on children's scholastic achievement. In Germany, where male teachers predominate, boys were found to be superior in reading achievement (Preston, 1962).

McNeil (1964) reported that in a reading-type task, boys learned more than girls when the learning situation was designed to approximate a mechanical manipulative activity, but there was a reversal in achievement when these children were taught reading in the classroom by women. Sex differences in verbal learning are not found in laboratory studies where attention is carefully controlled.

The educational implications of the present study, as well as those reported by Lahaderne (1968) and Cobb (1972), are that high and low reading achievement as well as sex differences appear to be related to attention. Behavior modification literature indicates that orienting behavior can be controlled by the teacher (Packard 1970; Walker & Buckley, 1968), and that such control of attention can be conducive to higher academic achievement (Cobb & Hops, in press). Since the time of James (1890), psychologists have believed that attention is the sine qua non for learning. It should be pointed out to teachers that both high and low achievement appear to be related to attention. Instructional success clearly requires that teachers secure and maintain the attention of all their pupils. In light of the finding that teachers tend to attribute academic failure to intra-student variables, the viewpoint expressed by Goldiamond and Dyrud seems appropriate: "The performance of the student may be to a considerable extent a function of the procedures used to establish that behavior; we should look to deficits in our own procedures before ascribing deficits to the students or difficulty to the problem " (1966, p. 99).

References

Baldwin, T. L., Johnson, T. J., & Wiley, D. E. The teacher's perception and attribution of causation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, 1970.

Cobb, J. A. Relationship of discrete classroom behaviors to fourth-grade academic achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 74-80.

Cobb, J. A., & Hops, H. Effects of academic survival skill training on low achieving first graders. Journal of Educational Research, in press.

Dykstra, R. Continuation of the coordinating center for first-grade reading instruction programs. (Project No. 6-1651, Contract No. OEC 3-7-001651-0472), Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education, 1967.

Gates, A. I. Sex differences in reading ability. The Elementary School Journal, 1961, 61, 431-34.

Goldiamond, I. & Dyrud, J. E. Reading as operant behavior. In J. Money (Ed.), The disabled reader: Education of the dyslexic child. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press, 1966, 93-115.

James, W. Principles of psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1890.

Jeffrey, W. E. & Samuels, S. J. Effect of method of reading training on initial learning and transfer. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1967, 6, 354-358.

Lahaderne, H. M. Attitudinal and intellectual correlates of attention: A study of four sixth-grade classrooms. Journal of Education Psychology, 1968, 59, 320-324.

McNeil, J. D. Programmed instruction versus usual classroom procedures in teaching boys to read. American Educational Research Journal, 1964, 1, 113-119.

Packard, R. G. The control of "classroom attention": A group contingency for complex behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1970, 3, 13-28.

Peterson, J. Effects of sex of E and sex of S in first and fifth grade children's paired-associate learning. Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 66, 81-84.

Preston, R. Reading achievement of German and American Children. School and Society, 1962, 90, 350-354.

Turnure, J. E. Children's reactions to distractors in a learning situation. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 115-122.

Turnure, J. E. Control of orienting behavior in children under five years of age. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 16-24.

Walker, H. M. & Buckley, N. K. The use of positive reinforcement in conditioning attending behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 245-250.

Footnote

[1]The authors would like to express their appreciation for the cooperation extended them by the pupils and teachers of the Minneapolis public school system. We also acknowledge the contributions of Karen Anderson, Bridgitte Schroeder, and Jenna Beard as observers, and of Martha Thurlow, Sharon Larsen, and Teara Archwamety, who assisted with data processing and analysis: Thanks to all.

TABLE 1

Mean word recognition scores and standard deviations for attention categories and sex.

	Attention Category				Sex	
	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4	Male	Female
$\bar{x}$ WORD RECOGNITION	16.18	25.05	26.83	33.87	22.68	30.03
SD	13.04	10.24	13.38	13.49	13.74	13.68

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

26. W. Bart & D. Krus. An ordering-theoretic method to determine hierarchies among items. Research Report #23. September 1971.

27. A. Taylor, M. Josberger, & J. Knowlton. Mental elaboration and learning in retarded children. Research Report #22. September 1971. (Mental Elaboration and Learning in EMR Children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1972, in press).

28. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Outerdirectedness in Educable Mentally Retarded boys and girls. Research Report #21. September 1971. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press).

29. R. Bruininks, T. Glaman, & C. Clark. Prevalence of learning disabilities: Findings, issues, and recommendations. Research Report #20. June 1971. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Miami Beach, April, 1971).

30. M. Thurlow & J. Turnure. Mental elaboration and the extension of mediational research: List length of verbal phenomena in the mentally retarded. Research Report #19. June 1971. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, in press. (Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1972, 14, 184-195).

31. G. Siegel. Three approaches to speech retardation. Occasional Paper #8. May, 1971.

32. D. Moores. An investigation of the psycholinguistic functioning of deaf adolescents. Research Report #18. May 1971. (Exceptional Children, May, 1970, 36, 645-652).

33. D. Moores. Recent research on manual communication. Occasional Paper #7. April, 1971. (Keynote Address, Division of Communication Disorders, Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, Miami Beach, April, 1971.

34. J. Turnure, S. Larsen, & M. Thurlow. Two studies on verbal elaboration in special populations I. The effects of brain injury II. Evidence of transfer of training. Research Report #17. April 1971. (Study I: American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press.)

35. R. Bruininks & J. Rynders. Alternatives to special class placement for educable mentally retarded children. Occasional Paper #6. March 1971. (Focus on Exceptional Children, 1971, 3, 1-12).

36. D. Moores. Neo-oralism and the education of the deaf in the Soviet Union. Occasional Paper #5. February, 1971. (Exceptional Children, January, 1972, 38, 377-384).

37. D. Feldman, B. Marrinan, & S. Hartfeldt. Unusualness, appropriateness, transformation and condensation as criteria for creativity. Research Report #16. February 1971. (American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, New York, February 1971).

38. P. Broen & G. Siegel. Variations in normal speech disfluencies. Research Report #15. January 1971. (Language & Speech, in press).

39. D. Feldman. Map understanding as a possible crystallizer of cognitive structures. Occasional Paper #4. January 1971. (American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 3, 484-502).

40. J. Rynders. Industrial arts for elementary mentally retarded children: An attempt to redefine and clarify goals. Occasional Paper #3. January 1971.

41. D. Moores. Education of the deaf in the United States*. Occasional Paper #2. November 1970. (Moscow Institute of Defectology, 1971, Published in Russian)

42. R. Bruininks & C. Clark. Auditory and visual learning in first-, third-, and fifth-grade children. Research Report #14. November 1970.

43. R. Bruininks & C. Clark. Auditory and visual learning in first grade educable mentally retarded normal children. Research Report #13. November 1970. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press).

44. R. Bruininks. Teaching word recognition to disadvantaged boys with variations in auditory and visual perceptual abilities. Research Report #12. November 1970. (Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1970, 3, 30-39.)

45. R. Bruininks & W. Lucker. Change and stability in correlations between intelligence and reading test scores among disadvantaged children. Research Report #11. October 1970. (Journal of Reading Behavior, 1970, 2, 295-305).

46. R. Rubin. Sex differences in effects of kindergarten attendance on development of school readiness and language skills. Research Report #10. October 1970. (Elementary School Journal, 72, No. 5, February 1972).

47. R. Rubin & B. Balow. Prevalence of school learning & behavior disorders in a longitudinal study population. Research Report #9. October 1970. (Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 293-299).

48. D. Feldman & J. Bratton. On the relativity of giftedness: An empirical study. Research Report #8. August 1970. (American Educational Research Annual Conference, New York, February, 1971).

49. J. Turnure, M. Thurlow, & S. Larsen. Syntactic elaboration in the learning & reversal of paired-associates by young children. Research Report #7. January 1971.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

50. R. Martin & L. Berndt. The effects of time-out on stuttering in a 12-year-old boy. Research Report #6. July 1970. (Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 303-304).

51. J. Turnure & M. Walsh. The effects of varied levels of verbal mediation on the learning & reversal of paired-associates by educable mentally retarded children. Research Report #5. June 1970. (Study I: American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 76, 60-67. Study II: American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 76, 306-312).

52. J. Turnure, J. Rynders, & N. Jones. Effectiveness of manual guidance, modeling & trial & error learning for inducing instrumental behavior in institutionalized retardates. Research Report #4. June 1970. (Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, in press).

53. J. Turnure. Reactions to physical and social distractors by moderately retarded institutionalized children. Research Report #3. June 1970. Journal of Special Education, 1970, 4, 283-294.

54. D. Moores. Evaluation of preschool programs: An interaction analysis model. Occasional Paper #1. April 1970. (Keynote Address, Diagnostic Pedagogy, International Congress on Deafness. Stockholm, August 1970, also presented at American Instructors of the Deaf Annual Convention, St. Augustine, Florida, April, 1970).

55. D. Feldman & W. Markwalder. Systematic scoring of ranked distractors for the assessment of Piagetian reasoning levels. Research Report #2. March 1970. (Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31, 347-362).

56. D. Feldman. The fixed-sequence hypothesis: Individual differences in the development of school related spatial reasoning. Research Report #1. March 1970.